DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 924 CS 508 402

AUTHOR Elmes-Crahall, Jane

TITLE Inter-Departmental Faculty Mentoring: Bridging Isolation in the Tenure Process at Small Colleges and Small Communications Departments.

PUB DATE 21 Nov 93

NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993). For a related document, see CS 508 403.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Faculty College Relationship; Females; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; Organizational Climate; *Organizational Communication; *Tenure

IDENTIFIERS *Wilkes University PA

ABSTRACT

Noting that a campus-wide faculty mentoring program begun by the Faculty Women's Caucus at Wilkes University has resulted in increased positive interaction between nontenured and tenured faculty, this paper traces the development of that program. Following an introduction, the first section of the paper discusses the changing organizational climate for faculty by providing data on Wilkes University--pointing out that Wilkes is a small school and that the Deapartment of Communication, the third largest in the school, has only six full-time faculty. The next section describes the rationale for the evolving pilot program in faculty mentoring, noting that in 1992-93 the Women's Caucus adopted a faculty mentoring program as one of their "action items." The final section provides a preliminary list of observations about faculty mentoring (a statistical assessment of the program will be completed sometime in 1994). Appendix A presents a Wilkes University Faculty Women's Caucus "Memorandum" which includes the following: (1) Rationale, (2) Goals of the FWC mentoring program, and (3) Implementation. Appendix B provides a Faculty Mentoring Program. Appendix C provides chapter 5 of "The Faculty and the University." (NH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Inter-Departmental Faculty Mentoring: Bridging Isolation in the Tenure Process at Small Colleges and Small Communications Departments

ED 364 924

A paper

by

Jane Elmes-Crahall, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Communications
Wilkes University
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18766

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Elmes-Crahall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the

Senior College and University Section at the

Speech Communication Association's Convention

Miami, Florida

November 21, 1993

CS508402

"What a good idea! Why did it takes us so long?"

In May, six women faculty from four different departments had lunch at a local Japanese restaurant. The stories were engaging, the interaction lively. The primary topic of conversation was how well prepared each one was for tenure and promotion to full professor--*at that moment.*

Twice in one week a member of the Foreign Language Department came by to discuss how he could introduce an interdisciplinary course without alienating a member of another academic department who taught a similar course.

And, over many cups of tea, a women faculty member explained how her husband, who teaches at the same university became so entangled in intra-departmental conflict that they were both becoming very concerned about their futures at the university.

These situations may sound familiar-- after all, faculty do turn to each other for support when difficulties arise, or when they need to get off campus and relax. What is unique about these situations is that each is a result of a campus-wide faculty mentoring program that began as a pilot program by the Faculty Women's Caucus at Wilkes University during spring semester of 1993. Although no magical solution was discovered in any of the situations, the interaction between nontenured and tenured faculty resulted in better informed decisions by the people involved. My colleague in the French Department, who is one of the nontenured faculty I mentor, usually comes into my office with this greeting, "It's time for a reality check!" After the lunch in May, one of the tenured members of the group commented, " I wish I had been able to speak with someone before I stood for tenure and promotion two years ago. I would have known what to expect when the 'surprises' came. What did take us so long?"

The Changing Organizational Climate for Faculty: Data on Wilkes University

Wilkes University has approximately 2,000 full-time undergraduate students and a graduate population of 1,000. There are 142 full-time faculty in 23 different academic departments. Department size ranges from two faculty members in Health Science Administration to thirteen faculty in Nursing. The average number of faculty in a department at Wilkes is six. In the School of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences, seven of the eleven departments have six or fewer faculty. The Department of Communications, which has the third largest number of majors in the School, has six full-time faculty. Nearly sixty percent of the University's faculty are tenured (85 of 142). Over fifty percent of the faculty members are tenured in thirteen departments. In recent years, the composition of many departments has changed dramatically because of restructuring, retirements, and turn-over of nontenured faculty after 2-3

years of service. Thus, in several instances, no one has stood for tenure or promotion in a decade or more. As senior faculty approach retirement in growing numbers, many departments are aware that without a solid foundation of tenured faculty, their programs could be in jeopardy.

From 1985-1990 three "Schools" were created, and several "new" departments were carved out of the previous structure. The Department of History and Political Science split into two units, each went into a different school. The Department of Engineering became two separate departments- Electrical/Computer Engineering and Mechanical/ Materials Engineering. By 1990, the Department of Language and Literature was divided to create three separate departments-- Communications, English, and Foreign Languages and Cultures. In addition, Theatre, which was initially part of Communications, merged with Music and Dance. Each change in organizational structure affected the tenured faculty remaining in departments. In a few instances (Political Science, Communications and GeoEnvironmental Sciences, most notably) only one tenured member remained.

The affects of having almost no senior faculty became apparent. Departmental tenure committees, which require at least three members who are tenured, have been nearly impossible to form without faculty from other disciplines. When program proposals came before the Curriculum Committee questions arose about whether the department could guarantee a qualified member would be available to teach the course in the future. Because associate and full professors composed the vast majority of faculty, certain departments found it very difficult to get their nontenured members elected to campus policy-making committees. As most of us know, a degree of stability is essential for the maintenance of any department.

During the same time period that the university was restructuring along school or divisional lines, the Faculty Women's Caucus was formed for a variety of reasons which I addressed in a paper presented earlier this year.[1] Women, who are 33% of the Wilkes faculty, have been disproportionately under-represented in higher ranks of the faculty and in key administrative positions. For example, there is one female full professor at the university, and no woman has been promoted to full professor in over ten years. The Dean of Student Life and the Dean of Graduate Studies are the only women in general officer ranks.

Within such an organizational climate of change, issues of seniority, annual evaluation, tenure and leaves became more complicated. "New" faculty often found themselves in departments without a history

[1] "The Faculty Women's Caucus: An Advocate for Equity and Change in Campus Organizational Culture," a paper by Jane Elmes-Crahall, presented to the ECA Convention, New Haven, CT, May 2, 1993.

of working together as a unit. And, many faculty expressed difficulty in figuring out how they fit within the university.

Wilkes University's "Evolving" Pilot Program in Faculty Mentoring: A Rationale

During 1992-93 the Women's Caucus adopted a faculty mentoring program as one of their action items. The stated purpose of the mentoring program was "to enable nontenured women faculty to approach tenure and promotion with a clearer understanding of the process."[2] According to the previously cited memo, specific goals of the FWC's mentoring program included: "(1) breaking down isolation that many women in smaller departments experience during the tenure process;[3] (2) establishing inter-departmental relationships between faculty new to Wilkes and those of us who have been here "a while"; (3) providing supportive, non-threatening opportunities for classroom observation to first and second year faculty; (4) supporting new faculty women in their efforts to have a voice in campus governance; (5) identifying steps in the tenure process that are especially confusing or problematic; and, (6) recommending ways to improve the TAP [tenure and promotion] process to the Faculty Affairs Council. The FWC program is meant to complement departmental and individual efforts already in place."

Twelve tenured women volunteered to serve as mentors after the initial memo, and eleven nontenured faculty women requested mentors. Within two weeks mentors and proteges were meeting, and two training sessions were organized by the FWC. The first training session involved women who stood for tenure and promotion in 1991-92 and the past-chair of the TAP Committee explaining the process, data-gathering, and areas of concern. The tenure candidates from the previous year also shared their "documents," and discussed how they decided what and how much to include. A week after the first workshop, mentors and nontenured caucus members attended a second session presented by one of the nursing faculty who did her dissertation research on the mentoring relationship between nursing faculty and department chairs at a number of colleges and universities. In her presentation, Dr. Leona Castor pointed out some of the potential pitfalls of faculty mentoring, such as the potential for mentors to co-opt a proteges' research, or the possibility of incompatible communication styles. These were wise words of caution. The Wilkes FWC discussed both the advantages and possible disadvantages of mentoring in the initial phase of our program. Partners in the mentoring program discussed their mutual

[2] See Appendix A, "Memo," dated 2/3/93 from J. Elmes-Crahall.

[3] At present, six academic departments have no female faculty, while one department (Nursing) has no male faculty. Nine departments have only one female faculty member. Thus, in fifteen of the twenty-three departments at Wilkes (or in 65% of the departments), there are either no women faculty or one woman faculty member.

expectations of the relationship at the conclusion of the second training session.

Recently, Sandler outlined "myths and commandments" of women as mentors in her essay in *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*[4] Sandler noted that many successful people in academe never had "the strong, intense relationships that we traditionally called mentoring" (Sandler). Indeed, as Sandler noted, myths about mentoring can stand in the way of a successful personal-professional relationship. She pointed out that mentors, as well as proteges, benefit from the relationships. And, men do not necessarily make better mentors than women. In fact, research suggests that male and female mentors tend to differ in how they perceive their roles within relationships with their proteges. Male mentors tend to be more "directive," focused on "work," and set the agenda for the relationship to the point of dictating career choices they think their proteges should make. Women mentors often show interest in both personal and professional choices, and tend to affirm the proteges' career choices. Sandler also points out that if it is an exclusive mentoring relationship, the burden on the mentor can be intense--very time consuming. Thus, she recommends non-exclusive mentoring with perhaps several mentors, each knowledgeable in different aspects of university life.

Issues of "power and familiarity" in mentoring were raised in the Autumn, 1993 newsletter of the Feminist Scholarship Interest Group of ICA.[5] And, when trainers were interviewed by Personnel Journal regarding mentoring workshops, they pointed out that corporate executives were surprised to learn they showed sex-bias in how they mentored men and women.

> Many exercises examine stereotypes and assumptions. One such exercise, "Mentoring Mark or Mentoring Mary," makes suble negative expectations apparent to group participants. In this training session, small work groups receive the following scenario: Mary, a 21-year-old college graduate and a person possessing a specific set of attributes, joins the company. One group is asked to describe how they would mentor her. The other work group is given a similar story but the new hire is Mark.They're asked how they would mentor him...After discussion, the groups compare notes. "Much to everyone's surprise, the mentoring the white male gets is different from the mentoring the woman gets...The assumption is that he's going to go further. He's told to go to Harvard Business School and then come back. She may go into a staff position rather than line management...They've told Mark to take risks and Mary not to make waves. [6]

After the Vice President of Academic Affairs at Wilkes read the FWC's proposal, I was asked to describe it to the full faculty at our monthly meeting. As a result of that meeting, I received calls from

---

[4] "Women as Mentors: Myths and Commandments," Bernice R. Sandler. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 10, 1993, B3.

[5] "Supplement: Mentoring within Feminist Context," *Feminist Con/text: Newsletter of the Feminist Scholarship Interest Group, International Communication Association, Autumn, 1993*, pp. 9-15.

[6] "The Corporate Response to Work Force Diversity," Charlene Marmer Solomon, *Personnel Journal*, August, 1989, 33.

several male colleagues. Two asked if they could participate as mentors for female faculty, and two requested mentors from the list of FWC mentors. From the first day of the announcement of the FWC's faculty mentoring program, it was seen as a probable campus-wide" policy" at Wilkes. In August of this year, at a faculty retreat, I was asked to conduct a workshop on "The Mentoring Process" as part of a two-day discussion of the faculty personnel process at the university. Twenty faculty from many departments attended and we discussed the FWC program and how it might be included in the faculty "development", tenure and promotion processes. I synthesized basic points from the FWC program and presented them to the workshop participants for discussion.[7] Our discussions began with these statements which were proposed in defining the relationship between faculty and the university: "The new faculty member is integrated into the University community through a process of mentoring and evaluation...The contribution of the faculty member is encouraged through mentoring and institutional support and measured through institutional interactions and evaluation as described..." (See Appendix C, sections 5-1-c and 5-1-e)

Several aspects of our workshop discussion surprised me. First of all, I was asked why the FWC felt the mentoring program should be "voluntary"; why couldn't the university require all nontenured faculty to participate as a condition of tenure? This was an important point because it enabled us to probe the unique nature of a mentoring relationship. We were able to explain that trust was a key to successful mentoring, and trust cannot be mandated. What impressed several of us from the FWC who were in the workshop was how readily our colleagues saw the wisdom in keeping mentoring part of, and yet apart from, formal tenure, evaluation and promotion procedures. Senior faculty at Wilkes had become so accustomed to completing forms to be included in their "personnel files," that anything related to teaching, scholarship, etc. was assumed to be part of the annual evaluation paper trail.

A second, and far more important, procedural question dealt with how the university could encourage all nontenured faculty to participate in a mentoring program without using any of the information shared in confidence with a mentor in the formal evaluation, tenure and promotion procedures.

At the August faculty retreat, our workshop members recommended an important addition to the program borrowed from the FWC: "Mentoring is a central component of faculty development at Wilkes but it is in no way tied to the formal tenure and promotion process. Participation in the mentoring program does not guarantee successful achievement of tenure. The existence of the the mentoring system in no

[7] See Appendix B, "Faculty Mentoring Program."

way diminishes the responsibility of the department chair for the integration of the new faculty into the University."[8]

Participants in the workshop felt strongly that the integrity of the mentoring program had to be protected. And, if any part of mentoring became part of the formal TAP or annual evaluation process (written classroom observations, for example), the nature of the relationship would be compromised. As our workshop secretary explained to the rest of the faculty, "we want to protect what is the best of the informal support networks among faculty, and use that network to improve the formal tenure and promotion procedures."

And, third, I was surprised at how readily faculty reached consensus on a campus mentoring program. To demonstrate that they wanted it to begin immediately, by the end of the first day of the retreat a list was circulated of 26 tenured faculty who would serve as mentors for nontenured faculty. However, several of us wanted further discussion to make sure these individuals were comfortable with a mentoring relationship and understood what type of commitment it involved. Members of the FWC voiced caution to faculty who seemed very eager for a radical departure from the status quo of tenure and promotion.

As a result of the August retreat, the mentoring program as outlined on pp. 3-4 of Appendix C was presented to the full faculty for adoption. The final vote was scheduled for November 18--the day I left for the SCA Convention. However, in the two previous hearings on the document, mentoring received almost unanimous support. One critic, from the Department of Music, Theatre and Dance, expressed concern about faculty in one discipline mentoring faculty in a different discipline. However, that is an isolated criticism. Most faculty at Wilkes understand that tenure requires presenting ones' knowledge, scholarship and teaching to a panel of colleagues from other fields for evaluation. Inter-departmental mentoring enables an individual from one field to present his or her credentials in terms a colleague from a different field can understand and appreciate. Based on my experience with mentoring at Wilkes, the inter-departmental nature of the relationship is one of the great strengths of this program. It is also a virtual necessity in a campus our size, especially within small departments who do not have three tenured faculty members to serve on an individual's Departmental Personnel Committee.

Currently, I am mentor to seven nontenured faculty-five women and two men. They teach in Spanish, Physics, Nursing, History, Accounting, Communications, and French departments. Yes, that is more than

[8] See Appendix C: "Chapter 5: The Faculty and the University," The Wilkes University Faculty Handbook, draft dated October 21, 1993, p. 3.

one mentor should handle! But, because I was spokesperson for the FWC when the proposal was presented to the faculty, many people associated me with the concept. In addition, I sit on the Faculty Affairs Council, and therefore can make discreet inquiries about salary equity, for example. Access to reliable information from deans and the provost has been very helpful in putting to rest, or verifying, "rumors" affecting the well being of proteges.

I meet with four of them privately, usually for lunch or in my office. Several of us "share" proteges. Two of my proteges and I are part of a luncheon "group," which consists of two mentors and four or five proteges. Every meeting I have had with a protege has been very interesting. I have learned about optic-laser research in physics, nineteenth century French literary criticism, and why accounting professors usually find it difficult to use interactive teaching strategies in their courses! More importantly, I have a much greater understanding of several of my colleagues and how they want to define their relationship with the university.

A Preliminary List of "Observations" about Faculty Mentoring

The FWC's "pilot program" in faculty mentoring never had a chance to be evaluated before it was proposed to the full faculty and included in the revised chapter on "The Faculty and the University," in the *Faculty Handbook, 1993.* Thus, I cannot provide a statistical assessment of the program--that will come one year from now. What I can provide are personal observations about the nature of interaction between a mentor and protege and the potential benefits of such a program for those of us in small departments at smaller institutions.

My personal observations about the nature of interaction in mentoring relationships include: (1) expect to learn about the personal concerns of a protege because there is no way to separate career development from personal choices; (2) understand from the beginning that as mentor you will keep everything you hear in confidence, unless the protege explicitly asks you to speak on his or her behalf (which I seldom do); (3) become sensitive to opportunities that might be of interest to your proteges, and do not hesitate to suggest their names to administration; (4) expect to hear "rumors" from proteges about their department, faculty in their department, relationships between faculty and administrators, etc. and make it clear how you respond to rumors; (5) if you are uncomfortable offering advise on a subject, say so, or refer the protege to someone who is more knowledgeable--you won't know everything you will be asked; (6) be prepared to "help" very bright, engaging nontenured colleagues leave your institution for a variety of reasons--a more promising position, family relocation, illness, lack of opportunity for growth at

your university, etc.; (7) try to include proteges, especially first or second year professors in informal, social, community-based groups of interest to them in order to break down isolation; (8) be prepared to see, read or experience the professional efforts of your protege because your presence and willingness to review their scholarship can mean a great deal; (9) be honest--false flattery and false optimism can be very demoralizing; (10) set limits on how much time you can give to mentoring--you will not get release time to do this, and (11) realize that if you have survived your institution long enough to be tenured and promoted, you do have something to offer a nontenured colleague--at least explanations of how things are done and who to see.

It is important that we realize how valuable mentoring can be to nontenured faculty, even though it is one aspect of a complex evaluation process. Mentoring relationships can be the "reality check" one of my proteges described; they can be an energetic break from our mundane activities on campus; they can be mutually beneficial and mutually frustrating; and they can be the difference between feeling isolated and feeling included within the university.

But, how can faculty mentoring benefit communications departments? I have been tenured at two different universities in my career. And, both times when I stood for tenure, I had to explain to colleagues from other fields why I was in "forensics," and what a "rhetorical critic" does. Many faculty in communication departments face tenure decisions made by colleagues who think of our discipline only in terms of public speaking and television. Thus, when we include citations in rhetorical criticism, organizational communication or language and social interaction, our colleagues have no idea what we do. We often have to instruct as well as defend our scholarship and teaching to tenure committees. And, if our explanations are not understood, our contributions could be devalued.

Mentoring provides an informal faculty network between communications faculty and senior faculty from other disciplines. And, they can be powerful bridges into campus governance and administration. One of my communications colleagues had a mentor from the history department when he stood for promotion. After sitting in on several of my colleague's classes, I heard the history professor tell the Faculty Affairs Council, in detail, about the research being done by the communication professor on political campaigns. Prior to their mentoring relationship, the history professor had no idea what my colleague was doing even though they saw each other every day.

In communications we know how diffusion of information can take place-with information being shared in a "cluster" formation. Mentoring seems to have the same potential--establish a clear understanding with

one person who then shares that insight with a number of people who might otherwise never hear the message.

And, on a personal note, sometimes it helps just to be able to get another perspective on what's going on within our professional lives and our universities. Mentoring isn't the only solution to a sense of isolation often felt by faculty in small departments, and at smaller institutions. But, it is one way to better understand what we are expected to contribute to the university, and to have those contributions appreciated by our peers.

Wilkes University Faculty Women's Caucus

Memorandum

TO: Faculty Women
FROM: Jane Elmes-Crahall, President, Faculty Women's Caucus
DATE: February 3, 1993
RE: **FWC's Faculty Mentoring Program**

The Faculty Women's Caucus is establishing a mentoring program to enable non-tenured women faculty to approach tenure and promotion with a clearer understanding of the process than many of us enjoyed. Currently, there are 19 tenured and 20 non-tenured faculty women at Wilkes University. We would like as much active participation in this program as possible by all faculty women because we will all benefit by participating.

Rationale: The mentoring program became one of FWC's action items for 1993 when several members expressed concerns about the TAP process, including: a lack of orientation given new faculty about their professional development, including the tenure process; the teaching and scholarship of faculty in smaller departments being evaluated by colleagues who do not understand the nature of the non-tenured faculty members' work; intra-departmental conflicts that complicate, and compromise, the TAP process; lack of a "paper trail" of classroom observations, activities, etc. that could disadvantage a candidate for tenure; the nature of questions asked by past campus TAP committees; and a lack of guidance on issues such as whether to stand for promotion and tenure at the same time, or when it is wise to "stop out" to complete a degree or when to consider waiving or delaying tenure.

Goals of the FWC mentoring program include: (1) breaking down isolation that many women in smaller departments experience during the tenure process; (2) establishing inter-departmental relationships between faculty new to Wilkes and those of us who have been here "a while"; (3) providing supportive, non-threatening opportunities for classroom observation to first and second year faculty; (4) supporting new faculty women in their efforts to have a voice in campus governance; (5) identifying steps in the tenure process that are especially confusing or problematic; and, (6) recommending ways to improve the TAP process to FAC. The FWC program is meant to <u>complement</u> departmental and individual efforts already in place.

Implementation: Thus far, we have decided to schedule two preliminary events on the mentoring program. FWC will devote it's regular March meeting to this issue. So, on **March 1 at 4:00 P.M. in the Alumni House**, the faculty women who went through the tenure and promotion process last year will discuss their experiences, including what surprised them and aspects of the process they wish they had known about ahead of time. An open discussion will follow to air questions and concerns about TAP, with an attempt to "demystify" the process. We strongly urge all faculty women to attend this discussion. **At the end of the discussion, we would like to make a list of women who are willing to serve as mentors available to non-tenured faculty.** In the spirit of our goals, we encourage faculty to consider mentors who are from department other than their own. After all, our professional activities need to be understood and appreciated by colleagues in other fields. Isolation makes it very difficult to flourish in the university.

Then, on **March 8, during FWC's "Celebration of Women" Day, Dr. Leona Castor of the Nursing Department will discuss her doctoral reseach on mentoring.** Leona's research dealt with chairs in nursing departments. We would like the women who agree to serve as mentors to attend Leona's workshop so we are better informed about this important professional relationship. Check the schedule for events on March 8 for the time.

By mid March, the mentoring program should be underway, but there is no real timeline. For this semester, the initial contact should come from the non-tenured faculty member. (After that, the mentoring should be on-going, with new faculty invited to participate from their first semester at Wilkes.) We hope the two colleagues will meet and discuss how the more senior member can help. Suggestions have included classroom teaching observations and critiques (including formal observations if requested), identifying standing committees of interest and nominating non-tenured faculty for vacancies, including new faculty in various campus and community events that might be perceived as "by invitation only," reviewing possible supporting materials for tenure applications, and occasionally getting together for lunch.

We hope you will take advantage of this unique opportunity to build a stronger support system for faculty women at Wilkes University.

If interested, please complete the form below and return it to Dr. Jane Elmes-Crahall, Dept. of Communications, Capin Hall by February 24.

Wilkes University Faculty Women's Caucus

Mentoring Project

Yes, I am interested in participating in the FWC's mentoring Project, and I understand one of the goals is to have non-tenured faculty work with more senior faculty from outside of their department: _____.

Name:_____. Department:_____.
Extention:_____. Current Academic Rank:_____.
I am _____tenured; _____ non-tenured.
If tenured:
Year of appointment to Wilkes:_____; Year of tenure:_____.
Yes, I am willing to serve as a mentor _____.
No, I am not willing to serve as a mentor_____.
Comments:

If non-tenured:
Year of appointment to Wilkes:_____.
Yes, I am interested in working with a faculty mentor_____.
No, I am not interested in working with a faculty mentor_____.
Comments:

I will____/will not _____ be able to attend FWC's meeting on March 1 where the list of faculty volunteering to serve as mentors will be distributed.

Faculty Mentoring Program

Rationale: *The mentoring program was designed to enable non-tenured faculty to approach tenure and promotion with a clear understanding of what their role is within the university. Additionally, the Wilkes program emphasizes inter-departmental mentoring. Non-tenured faculty will benefit from inter-departmental mentoring because their professional activities need to be understood and appreciated by colleagues in other fields.*

(The Wilkes Faculty Women's Caucus implemented a mentoring program during 1992-93 when several members expressed concerns about the TAP process, including: a lack of orientation given new faculty about their professional development, including the tenure process; teaching and scholarlship of faculty in smaller departments being evaluated by colleagues who do not understand the nature of the non-tenured members' work; intra-departmental conflicts that complicate, and compromise, the TAP process; lack of a "paper trail" of classroom observations, activities, etc that could disadvantage a candidate for tenure, the nature of questions asked by past TAP committees; and a lack of guidance from departments on issues such as whether to stand for promotion and tenure at the same time, when it is wise to "stop out" to complete a degree, or when to consider waiving or delaying tenure.)

Goals of the mentoring program: *(1) supplementing departmental and individual efforts already in place; (2) breaking down isolation that faculty in smaller departments often feel during the tenure process; (3) establishing inter-departmental relationships between faculty new to Wilkes and those faculty who have been here "a while"; (4) providing supportive, non-threatening opportunities for classroom observation to first and second year faculty; (5) supporting new faculty in their efforts to gain a voice in campus governance; and (6) identifying and clarifying steps in the tenure process that are especially confusing or problematic to newcomers.*

Guidelines for participation in the mentoring program: *The mentor-protege relationship is a unique interpersonal bond that has the potential to be both professionally enriching and personally empowering. However, by its nature, the relationship places great responsibility on both participants. Although guiding "by example," mentors must be aware that proteges have the right to pursue their own goals, regardless of the advise given by the mentor. And, proteges must be respectful of the mentors' commitments, and not ask the senior faculty member to make decisions they should make on their own behalf. The goal is mutual respect that results in greater independence.*

Considering the nature of the mentor-protege relationship, the following guidlelines should be respected: (1) participation by senior faculty mentors should be completely voluntary (the key to a successful mentoring relationship is trust, and trust cannot be mandated); (2) mentoring relationships should not replace any exisiting departmental or campus evaluation procedures--it should supplement ; (3) proteges and mentors may work as "team," with a protege sharing several mentors, or several mentors working with a number of proteges; (4) a mentoring relationship can end at any point if either participant wants to end the process; and (5) unless it is agreed to by both parties, classroom observations or other peer evaluations by the mentor will not become part of the protege's official file.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Implementation of mentoring program:

(1) An open discussion on the tenure and promotion process should be held as part of a new faculty orientation each fall. It will allow senior faculty to share experiences with tenure in order to "demystify" the TAP process for new faculty. New faculty should be encouraged to ask questions.

(2) All non-tenured faculty should be surveyed each fall to determine their interest in the mentoring program. A list of non-tenured faculty interested in the mentoring program should be compiled no later than October 1 of each year.

(3) A list of tenured faculty who are willing to serve as mentors should be compiled, and circulated to non-tenured faculty who wish to participate in the mentoring program no later than November 1. This list should be updated each year because faculty who acquire proteges during one academic year, may not wish to take on new proteges because many of the mentoring relationships will last several years.

(When the Faculty Women's Caucus initiated it's mentoring program in spring 1993, senior faculty who planned to be mentors attended a workshop by Dr. Leona Castor of the Nursing Dept. Dr. Castor did her doctoral research on mentoring relationships in nursing; her insights were very helpful for first-time faculty mentors. Such a training session should be included, perhaps sponsored by the Faculty Development Committee or the VPAA's office.)

(4) Non-tenured faculty should be encouraged to select at least one mentor from a department other than their own .

(Current faculty evaluation procedures mandate involvement of department chairs and tenured departmental faculty. However, in small or new departments, the number of tenured faculty may be small. Non-tenured faculty will also benefit from the "outside" perspective because professional activities need to be understood and appreciated by colleagues in other fields. Thus, non-tenured faculty members should receive mentoring from their department chair, at least one senior member of their department, and at least one mentor from a department other than their own.)

(5) The initial contact should come from the non-tenured faculty member. The purpose of the initial meeting should be to explore ways the senior faculty member can help the non-tenured member.

CHAPTER 5

THE FACULTY AND THE UNIVERSITY

5-1. The Faculty and the University

The faculty is the heart of the University. Faculty members are teacher-scholars who are invited to come to Wilkes to contribute as professionals to the attainment of the institution's educational mission. As professionals they, to a significant degree, define the specific ways in which they will make their own contributions.

The relationship between faculty and University is an evolving one, and one which potentially can last for the lifetime of the individual faculty member. In such a relationship, the welfare of both the individual and the University must be protected. To this end, the relationship is based upon several fundamental principles:

a. The right of the faculty member to seek and teach the truth without fear or discrimination is supported by the University guarantee of non-discrimination and academic freedom, and the University award of tenure to a significant portion of the faculty.

b. The operation of a clear, effective appointment process is essential to the establishment of a mutually respectful, stimulative and productive association between faculty member and University.

c. The new faculty member is integrated into the University community through a process of mentoring and evaluation. Through this process, both University and individual can determine their mutual compatibility. The faculty member should demonstrate compelling evidence during his/her probationary period that he/she is and will continue to be an active and contributing member of the University. The University, in turn must clearly state its expectations and support the faculty member's continued professional development.

d. The professional growth and expanding responsibility of a faculty member for the institution is recognized by promotion through the ranks of the faculty.

e. The contribution of the faculty member is encouraged through mentoring and institutional support and measured through institutional interactions and evaluation as described below.

5-2. BASIC FACULTY RIGHTS

It is the obligation of the University to provide an environment in which free inquiry can be carried out without fear of reprisal. To this end, the University recognizes diversity of opinion and culture and extends to all faculty, full and part-time, the protection of the rights specified in this section.

5-2-1. Non-Discrimination

Wilkes University, as an Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action employer, complies with applicable Federal and Commonwealth laws and local ordinances prohibiting discrimination. It is the policy of Wilkes University that no person, on the basis of race, gender, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, marital status, handicap, sexual or affectional preference, or Vietnam-era veteran status, shall be discriminated against in employment, educational programs and activities, or admissions.

The University supports the Ethnic Intimidation Act of 1982 of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides additional penalties for the commission of illegal acts of intimidation when such actions are motivated by hatred of the victim's race, color, religion, or national origin.

5-2-2. Academic Freedom

It is the policy of Wilkes University to maintain and encourage full freedom in inquiry, research, and teaching for faculty members within their subject area. This freedom entitles faculty members to discuss their own subject in the classroom, conduct inquiries within their subject area, and carry out research activities to further the advancement of knowledge in their field with no limitation imposed by the University or society. However, faculty members may not claim the privilege of discussing controversial material not related to their subject in the classroom. The University recognizes the citizen rights of the faculty member; in exercising these rights, however, faculty members must recognize the special position their association with an institution of higher learning creates. As such, faculty members must show proper restraint, respect for the opinion of others, and make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking on behalf of the University.

The application of these principles shall not be construed to guarantee that faculty members:

a. will teach the same course or courses throughout their association with the University;

b. have a fixed annual wage or fixed annual increment to their wages; or

c. have a fixed time scale for promotion.

5-2-3. Redress of Grievance

For grievance procedure, see ¶5-10-1a and 5-10-2a.

5-3. APPOINTMENT

5-3-1. Position Identification.

Position descriptions, including qualifications, experience, terms of appointment, rank, and salary shall be determined by the President upon recommendation from the VPAA, who in turn shall receive recommendations from the appropriate school dean and department chair.

5-3-2. Search Procedures.

It is the responsibility of the department chair, in consultation with the appropriate dean, to conduct searches for new faculty. The procedures include the following:

a. The department chair, or designated representative, shall prepare appropriate announcements of the vacancy and make recommendations to the school dean for appropriate locations in which to place the announcement. The dean shall arrange to publicize the vacancy.

b. Applications for vacancies shall be received by the department chair.

c. The selection process shall be conducted by the chair, or designated representatives. All faculty within the department shall be given the opportunity to review applications and to make recommendations as to those considered to be the most qualified to fill the position. The final selection of candidates for interview will be made by the department chair, after consultation with the other members of the department and with the dean.

5-3-3. Interviews.

Applicants for faculty positions are interviewed by

a. the primary department chairperson,

b. the appropriate Dean,

c. as many department members as practical,

d. the Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or the President, and

e. other faculty, when appropriate, as determined by faculty and dean (e.g. consultation on disciplinary specialties or joint appointments).

To the maximum extent reasonable, a department chairperson should require an applicant to participate in seminars, class presentations, or departmental interviews prior to submitting a recommendation for appointment to the faculty.

5-3-4. Recommendations.

The primary department chairperson will make a recommendation for a faculty appointment through the appropriate Dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will make a recommendation to the President. The Chairperson's written recommendation should incorporate a review of the candidate's performance and the opinion of the department members participating in the interview.

5-3-5. Administration to faculty trans

Members of the administration *without acac* *rank* or holding adjunct, or non-tenure track acad rank who are transferred to positions as full- faculty members must be recommended for reg academic rank in accordance with the provisior paragraph *5-3-4*. Provisions of paragraph *5-3-3* wi applied insofar as is deemed appropriate or necess.

5-3-6. Special Appointments

Part-time faculty are recommended for appointm by the appropriate chairperson and Dean to the V President for Academic Affairs. Generally, part-ti instructors will be given the title of Lecturer. Individu who have a record of distinguished accomplishment their field or who have a continuing relationship wi a department or school may be awarded the title Adjunct Professor. (See also ¶5-7-2.)

5-3-7. Joint Appointments.

a. New appointments. The appointment of new faculty members to positions in which their services are divided between two (or more) departments or schools are governed by the rules specified above, with the following alterations:

1. The duties of the faculty member in each department or school shall be established through consultation between the affected chairs and deans and clearly delineated in writing prior to the initiation of the search procedure. The department and school of primary responsibility shall be designated as part of the process.

2. The chair of the department holding primary responsibility shall conduct the search procedure. The primary chair must consult closely with the chair of the secondary department at each step of the process.

3. Interviews shall be structured to insure that the members of the secondary department have sufficient opportunities to evaluate the potential of the candidate.

4. Recommendations for appointment shall be made jointly by the appropriate department chairs and deans to the VPAA. In any case where the concerned parties are unable to arrive at a mutually acceptable decision, the VPAA will make the decision.

b. Joint appointments of faculty already holding appointments. Members of the University faculty may request appointment to a secondary department under the following conditions:

1. The request must state the qualifications of the applicant and indicate the manners in which a joint appointment will benefit the professional development of the applicant and contribute to the welfare of the University.

2. The request must be approved by the primary chair and dean, the approval including an assessment of any adverse effects which might result upon the programs of the primary department.

3. The request will be evaluated by the secondary department chair, in consultation with the department members and the secondary dean.

4. Recommendation for appointment or rejection of the application, together with justification, will be forwarded by the secondary department chair to the appropriate dean, who shall forward the recommendation or rejection, together with his concurrence or non-concurrence to the VPAA for action.

5. In cases where the primary chair and dean and the secondary chair and dean cannot agree on the value of the proposed appointment to the University, the VPAA will make the final decision.

c. Term limits. Joint appointments will be for a maximum term of three years, or a shorter time to be agreed upon in writing by the appointee and the concerned deans and chairs. The appointment will be reviewed during the final year of the term by the appointee and the concerned deans and chairs to ascertain whether or not it is in the best interests of the individual, the affected departments, and the University to renew the appointment. All parties must concur to renewal.

5-3-8. English proficiency.

All candidates are assessed for adequate proficiency in spoken English, in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth.

5-4. MENTORING

5-4-1. General

The mentoring program is designed to enable non-tenured faculty to approach tenure and promotion with a clear understanding of what their role is within the university. Additionally, the Wilkes program emphasizes inter-departmental mentoring. Non-tenured faculty will benefit from inter-departmental mentoring because their professional activities need to be understood and appreciated by colleagues in other fields.

Mentoring is a central component of faculty development at Wilkes but it is in no way tied to the formal tenure and promotion process. Participation in the mentoring program does not guarantee successful achievement of tenure.

The existence of the mentoring system in no way diminishes the responsbility of the department chair for the integration of the new faculty into the University.

5-4-2. Program Goals.

The mentoring process is designed to:

a. supplement departmental and individual efforts already in place;

b. break down isolation that faculty in smaller departments often feel during the tenure process;

c. establish interdepartmental relationships between new and experienced faculty;

d. provide additional supportive, non-threatening opportunities for classroom observation to non-tenured faculty;

e. support new faculty in their efforts to gain a voice in campus governance; and

f. identify and clarify steps in the tenure process that are especially confusing or problematic to newcomers.

5-4-3. Guidelines for participation.

The mentor-protege relationship is a unique interpersonal bond that has the potential to be both professionally enriching and personally empowering. However, by its nature, the relationship places great responsibility on both participants. Although guiding "by example," mentors must be aware that proteges have the right to pursue their own goals, regardless of the advice given by the mentor. And, proteges must be respectful of the mentors' commitments, and not ask senior faculty members to make decisions they should make on their own behalf. The goal is mutual respect that results in greater independence.

Considering the nature of the mentor-protege relationship, the following guidelines should be respected:

a. Participation by senior faculty mentors should be completely voluntary. The key to a successful mentoring relationship is trust, and trust cannot be mandated.

b. Mentoring relationships should not replace any existing departmental or campus evaluation procedures; they should supplement.

c. Proteges and mentors may work as a "team," with a protege sharing several mentors, or several mentors working with a number of proteges.

d. A mentoring relationship can end at any point if either participant wants it to end.

e. Unless it is agreed to by both parties, classroom observations or other peer evaluations by the mentor will not become part of the protege's official file.

5-4-4. Implementation.

a. An open discussion of the tenure and promotion process should be held as part of new faculty orientation each fall. It will allow senior faculty to share experiences with tenure in order to "demystify" the TAP process for new faculty. New faculty should be encouraged to ask questions.

b. All non-tenured faculty shall be given the opportunity to select a mentor during their first semester of appointment.

c. A list of tenured faculty who are willing to serve as mentors will be compiled, and circulated to non-tenured faculty no later than 15 September. This list should be updated each year because faculty who acquire proteges during one academic year, may not wish to take on new proteges because mentoring relationships may last

several years.

d. The mentoring relationship is designed to be supportive of the protege. It is recommended that the new faculty member enter into a dialogue with a mentor of his/her choosing prior to making a final selection. The initial contact should come from the non-tenured faculty member. The purpose of the initial meeting should be to explore ways the senior faculty member can help the non-tenured member.

e. In the event that an established mentoring relationship is not successful, either the mentor or the protege has the right to withdraw without prejudice. The protege will have the right to select a new mentor.

5-5. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
To be written

5-6. EVALUATION
To be written

5-7. ACADEMIC RANK & PROMOTION

5-7-1. Academic Rank

Each member of the regular full-time teaching faculty, with the exception of certain special appointments described below, holds the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. To qualify for appointment, the candidate should, as a minimum, meet the following criteria. (See ¶5-7-5.)

a. Assistant Professor

This is normally the entry-level rank for faculty appointments.

1) Possession of the doctorate or terminal degree, or other experience judged to be of equal value. A.B.D.'s may be hired with the understanding that the work towards the degree must be completed within a specified period, not to exceed three years.

2) Those who have shown unusual experience of significant value in their field, have performed creative work in their field, or have demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher over a period of years may be given consideration in circumstances where the doctorate or terminal degree is lacking.

b. Associate Professor

The rank of associate professor is normally awarded in recognition of service and the assumption of institutional responsibility at Wilkes culminating in the simultaneous award of tenure, or in recognition of prior distinguished service in higher education or other relevant areas of expertise prior to employment at Wilkes.

1) Possession of the doctorate or terminal degree in the field of one's principal teaching activity. Only outstanding scholarship, excellence in teaching, and dedicated service over a period of years in the rank of assistant professor may justify the awarding of this rank to those without a doctorate or terminal degree. These considerations will be in addition to fulfillment of all criteria routinely used in recommendations for promotion.

2) Six years of consistent teaching experience at the rank of assistant professor or above (or other experience judged to be of equal value).

c. Professor

The rank of professor is reserved for those who have demonstrated leadership in the intellectual and institutional development of Wilkes University. Entry-level appointments to this rank will be made only under exceptional conditions where it is determined that the individual can make a unique and significant contribution to the University.

1) Possession of the doctorate or terminal degree in the field of one's principal teaching activity. Only distinguished scholarship (¶5-8-3b), excellence in teaching, and dedicated service over a period of years in the rank of associate professor may justify the awarding of this rank. These considerations will be in addition to fulfillment of all criteria routinely used in recommendation for promotion.

2) Seven years of consistent teaching experience at the rank of associate professor or above (or other experience judged to be of equal value).

5-7-2. Special Appointments (See ¶5-3-6)

All matters of compensation, duration of appointment, and assigned responsibilities of persons offered special appointments are to be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs after consultation with the Dean of the appropriate school, the appropriate department chairperson, and the applicant. Individuals employed under a special appointment, with the exception of term appointments, are not eligible to sit as voting members of standing committees, to vote in meetings of the faculty, or to be entitled to representation in the affairs of the faculty or administration of the University.

a. Term Appointments/Overstrength Appointments. Overstrength appointees are those appointed to non-tenure-eligible positions. The rank of such an appointee is modified with the word "visiting." Term appointments not leading to tenure may be offered at all ranks. Persons holding such appointments will be accorded all the rights of their faculty ranks; they will be informed in writing that their contracts are terminal. Ordinarily, total service will not exceed three years. In the event that such persons are placed on a tenure track, any time served under term contracts will count toward tenure.

Overstrength appointees are offered term contracts.